

"Pauci, quos æquus amavit
Juppiter, aut ardens evexit ad æthera virtus,
dis geniti potuere."

"Exinde per amplum
mittitur Elysium et pauci læta arva tene-
mus."

But these few bright and shining examples are in the minority, and teaching has suffered. Mrs. Stowe says: "Men of tact, versatility, talent and piety, will not devote their lives to teaching. They must be ministers and missionaries and all that, and while there is such a thrilling call for action in this way, every man who is merely teaching feels as if he were a Hercules with a distaff, ready to spring to the first trumpet that calls him away." Had we numbered more men like Agassiz, Arnold, or Horace Mann, Mrs. Stowe would not say, "merely teaching."

But these hindrances which make teaching appear unattractive to men of culture are not the only obstacles to their electing it as a life work. A strong objection has been that it does not demand of its followers the high degree of culture which the so-called learned professions demand. A man is not admitted to the bar because he is a college graduate. Neither would he for that reason be allowed to practise medicine. The preacher is trammelled who gets from the college to the pulpit; but the teacher goes at once to the school-room. There is a prevalent notion that anybody can teach school; that the teacher, like the poet, is born, not made, *nascitur non fit*. So far as poets are concerned the theory can do no harm, as the world, by the *nascitur* process, has been well supplied with poets. It is a dangerous and pernicious doctrine in its application to teaching. The call for able leaders to man our secondary schools has been long and loud, and a *fit* process for fitting them for their work is in demand. Why need this work suffer longer by comparison with that of the learned professions? Why may not teachers take their

rightful place in the world and exert that influence over society to which they are entitled? Why is not their work superior to that of any other profession? Why may not they be regarded as producers, as factors in the material and intellectual growth of the nation?

Their business is to make men and women out of the crude material which comes into their hands. Not to instruct, merely, but to educate, develop brains and character, in short, to make a man. If man was the noblest work of the Creator, His last and best creation, what higher work can any man do than further the Creator's plan in developing honest men? "I call a complete and generous education," says Milton, "That which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, magnanimously, all the offices, both public and private, of peace and war." This work demands a preparation second to none; a type of character such that nothing short of the noblest native endowment, supplemented by the highest possible culture, can satisfy the demand. No smattering of the sciences, languages, and mathematics, no dilettantism in the matter of training, but a varied and exacting course of study. A need has been recognized, a beginning made, which will, I believe, result in the establishment of this new ideal school.

"We may not be able to realize our ideal,
But woe be to us if we have no ideal to
realize."

Right along this line, I believe that we can do something so to elevate the work of teaching that it shall be regarded as one of the learned professions. A beginning, in this country, has been made at Johns Hopkins; Clark University is continuing the same. The work of Professor Payne in the University of Michigan is in the same line. All these movements, and others which might be named, especially the effort among Massachusetts' teachers during